

**REMARKS**

By this Amendment, non-elected claims 1-23 have been canceled. Additionally, independent claim 33 has been canceled, and new independent claim 59 has been added. Accordingly, claims 24-32 and 34-59 are now pending.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections set forth in the first Office action in view of the amendments and remarks made herein.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Several of the claims have been amended to address the informalities noted by the Examiner. In view of these amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claims 24, 32, 34, 35 and 42-43.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 24-27, 29, 34-36, 39, 41-46, 48-52 and 57-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kolomeitsev (US Pat. 6,844,653). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claims 24, 34 and 44 recite, among other things, one or more end caps having a body portion configured for positioning on the yoke portion of a stator segment. The body portion includes first and second ends for coupling to ends of adjacent end caps to substantially hold the adjacent segments together. Thus, the coupling ends recited by these claims are positioned adjacent the yoke portions of the stator segments. In contrast, Kolomeitsev's coupling ends (i.e., the extensions 222 and recesses 224 cited by the Patent Office) are positioned adjacent the pole ends of

the segments and thus away from the stator yoke 122. Accordingly, Kolomeitsev does not anticipate amended claim 24, 34 or 44.

Further, Kolomeitsev lacks any suggestion of positioning the extensions 222 and recesses 224 adjacent the stator yoke 122. On the contrary, Kolomeitsev specifically teaches locating the extensions 222 and recesses 224 adjacent the pole ends so that the extensions 222 and recesses 224 provide a slot wedge function (similar to the slot wedges disclosed in Figs. 1 and 8-10 of Kolomeitsev). Accordingly, Kolomeitsev neither teaches nor suggests positioning coupling ends adjacent to the yoke portions of stator segments. For these reasons, independent claims 24, 34 and 44 are patentable over Kolomeitsev, as are claims 25-32 and 45-50 which depend from claims 24 and 44, respectively.

Independent claims 35, 42 and 43 have also been amended herein. As amended, these claims each recite one or more end caps having a body portion configured for aligning adjacent segments in a direction generally parallel to a central axis of the stator (i.e., for axially aligning adjacent segments). Kolomeitsev lacks any teaching or suggestion of this feature. Although Kolomeitsev's extensions 222 and recesses 224 may inhibit movement of adjacent segments in a circumferential direction, they do not inhibit movement in the axial direction or otherwise assist in axially aligning adjacent segments. In fact, it appears that the extensions 222 and recesses 224 are specifically configured to permit movement in the axial direction, which is how the tooth portions are inserted into or removed from the stator yoke 122. Accordingly, claims 35, 42 and 43 are patentable over Kolomeitsev, as are claims 36-41 which depend from claim 35.

Independent claim 51 has been amended to recite the positioning step as including positioning end caps on the stator segments with the end caps substantially covering the segments' yoke portions. In contrast, Kolomeitsev's bobbins 206 only cover the teeth 202, and do not substantially cover the stator yoke 122. Accordingly, Kolomeitsev fails to anticipate amended claim 51, or claims 52-58 which depend therefrom.

#### **NEW CLAIM 59**

By this Amendment, new claim 59 has been added. Claim 59 recites an end cap having, among other things, first and second ends configured for coupling to ends on adjacent end caps to substantially hold the adjacent segments together. The first end includes a deformable male member and the second end includes a female member. The deformable male member is configured for snap fitting with the female member of an adjacent end cap. In contrast, Kolomeitsev merely discloses an extension 222 and recess 224 configured as complimentary puzzle pieces. Kolomeitsev lacks any teaching or suggestion of deformable male member configured for snap fitting with a female member of an adjacent segment. Accordingly, claim 59 is allowable over Kolomeitsev.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicant notes the Examiner's favorable indication that claims 28, 30-32, 37-38, 40, 47 and 53-56 recite allowable subject matter. However, in view of the amendments

and remarks provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable, and that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-15-05

By: 

Michael J. Thomas, Reg. 39,857

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
(314) 726-7500